

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexasdra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.nepto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | | |
|---|------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|--|
| 10/809,716 | 03/24/2004 | Kalyan Muthukumar | 42P18140 | 8094 | | |
| 45209 7590 11/04/2008 INTEL/BSTZ BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP | | | EXAM | EXAMINER | | |
| | | | VU, TUAN A | | | |
| 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | | |
| JOHN THE | , 0.13 1005 1010 | 2193 | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| | | | 11/04/2008 | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Ī | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|-----------------|-------------------|--|
| | 10/809,716 | MUTHUKUMAR ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | TUAN A. VU | 2193 | |

| | TUAN A. VU | 2193 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | orrespondence add | ress | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 29 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS | S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F | OR ALLOWANCE. | | | | |
| M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | the same day as filing a Notice of a eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance | Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | date of the final rejection | n. | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date whave been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of a value of 27 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office | te extension fee e action; or (2) as | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | of the date of appeal. Since a | | | |
| <u>AMENDMENTS</u> | | | | | | |
| ∑ The proposed amendment(s) flied after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ∑ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); | | | | | | |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or | er form for appeal by materially red | lucing or simplifying ti | e issues for | | | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> (See 37 CFR 1.1° | | ected claims. | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | 1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). | | | |
| Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | • | _ | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) in how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | | l be entered and an e | planation of | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1.3-13.15-26.28-34 and 36-38</u> . | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1 | to provide a | | | |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | • | | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | | | | |
| | /Tuan A Vu/ Examiner, Art Unit 2193 | | | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed changes to the language in terms of "new slack value" computing and recomputing require reconsideration and possible additional searchs. The claims as rejected previously are deemed non-allowable based on interpretation of said claims language, and the rejection stands. Since the claims as re-submitted are not in condition of allowance and that further modification of the claims would not simplify effects of a possible Appeal, the amendments thus proposed will not be entered. The rejection regarding 'respectating' a resource/slack value is deemed commensurate with examiner's interpretation of the previous set of claims as explained in the Office Action; that is, the current Applicant's argument based on the above proposed amendments would be considered non applicable or not sufficient to overcome the Final Action.